MARINA ORSINI-JONES

16. TROUBLESOME LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE: IDENTIFYING THRESHOLD CONCEPTS IN GRAMMAR LEARNING

INTRODUCTION

Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita
mi ritrovai per una selva oscura,
che la diritta via era smarrita.[1]
(Dante, Divina Commedia, Inferno, Canto Primo:31)

The discussion about threshold concepts in Meyer and Land (2003, 2005) has reverberations that bring to mind Medieval studies and Medieval literature, namely Dante's *La Divina Commedia* and the troubled state in which the author/narrator finds himself at the beginning of his allegorical journey, the latter being both personal ('mi ritrovai' – I found myself) and collective ('nostra vita' – our life). In fact, Dante's journey could be seen as a reflection of the four modes of variation proposed by Meyer, Land and Davies (this volume) i.e. *subliminal* (his prior knowledge, his 'baggage' before the journey), *pre-liminal* (*Inferno*/Hell), *liminal* (*Purgatorio*/Purgatory) and *post-liminal (Paradiso*/Paradise). At the beginning of the journey there is darkness, there is a dark forest, it is difficult to find the way.

It could be argued that students embark on a similar troublesome voyage when faced with concepts so challenging that they feel lost. Like Dante's allegorical journey, learning is both a personal and a collective affair. Ackermann points out that 'Without connection people cannot grow, yet without separation they cannot relate' (1996, p. 32).

It is proposed here that to help students with crossing threshold concepts it is necessary to devise student-centred activities that allow them to engage both in individual and collective reflection on the troublesome knowledge encountered. The overcoming of stumbling blocks will be greatly helped by the opening up of a dialogue between students and tutors and amongst students themselves, and by activities that foster this dialogue, as well as by encouraging students to engage in 'metareflection' on the difficulties encountered.[2]

This chapter will focus on the troublesome knowledge experienced by students in the module *Academic and Professional Skills for Language Learning* when carrying out an assessed grammar project in groups. Between 2002-2006 this

R. Land, J.H.F. Meyer & J. Smith (Eds.). Threshold Concepts within the Disciplines, 213–226.

module was compulsory for all year 1 undergraduates reading a language (or two) as a major or joint degree subject at Coventry University.

The data reproduced here refer to two cohorts of students participating in this study, those in academic years 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 with 128 students in total. In order to evaluate the students' learning experience following the introduction of a grammar project, both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered. The marks received by each student for their project, their feedback in individual reports and portfolios and WebCT tracking data were analysed. Roughly 30% of all students (self-selected) participated in semi-structured group interviews in each of the two academic years studied.

The findings of this research showed that the stumbling blocks encountered by students reading languages while engaging in reflection on how they learn a language are both of a subject specific nature (specific grammar concepts) and of a more generic skills nature (independent learning, reflection on personal development planning). Here the focus will be on the identification of the subject specific issues encountered by students while engaging in an assessed grammar group project. It will illustrate how this task was created to provide languages students with the basic tools necessary to understand how grammar works. As part of the project, students had to analyse sentences according to principles of functional grammar (using the Hallidayan *rank scale* – Halliday, 1985). The analysis of the data collected on this showed that students found the grammar analysis troublesome. It is proposed here that the functional grammar's *rank scale* is a threshold concept, as defined by Meyer and Land (2003, 2005).

The distinguishing feature of this study in comparison with the majority of the other literature on threshold concepts (Meyer and Land 2003; 2005; 2006), is that its outcomes are based entirely upon interviews carried out with students – not staff – and upon students' 'metareflections' – both individual and in groups – about their learning experience. The identification of the threshold concept has therefore been entirely based upon the students' voices and underpinned by a student-centred constructionist and dialogic approach (Laurillard, 1993; Kafai & Resnick, 1996; Perkins, 2006; Orsini-Jones & Jones, 2007).

IDENTIFYING ISSUES AND SOLVING THEM – THE GRAMMAR PROJECT TASK

A wider variety of students, with a range of different backgrounds and needs, is entering UK higher education due to government measures to widen participation (Warren, 2002). A typical first-year cohort of undergraduate languages students at Coventry University presents the following characteristics:[3]

- Age range 18-70;
- Variety of degree titles under study (International Relations and German, Tourism and French, Marketing and Russian, Business and Italian, IT and Spanish, French and German, etc.);
- Different levels of prior knowledge;

- Different expectations from the learning experience at university (part-time/full-time, mature/18-year-olds);
- A-level grades varying from 'E' to 'A';
- Different levels of ICT proficiency;
- 12% of students with a declared disability;
- 13 different nationalities (and, as a consequence, many non-native speakers of English).

This diversity appears to be reflected in the students' previous levels of grammatical knowledge. Focus group research, carried out between 2000-2002, and the analysis of students' work showed that many were challenged by grammar analysis and had difficulties in grasping fundamental grammar concepts, such as word classifications (noun, adjective, verb, etc.) and the structure of a sentence.

In addition, the Subject Benchmark Statements for Languages and Related Studies (LRS) were published in 2002. Under the heading '4.2 Language related skills' it is stated that by the end of their course:

> Students of LRS will have developed appropriate linguistic tools and metalanguage to describe and analyse the main features of the language(s) studied. They will thus be able to make effective use of language reference materials, such as grammars, standard and specialised dictionaries and corpora, to refine knowledge and understanding of register, nuances of meaning and language use. Students of LRS will be effective and self-aware independent language learners. (QAA, 2002, p. 9)

It was therefore important to foster the development of the above-mentioned skills, particularly in view of the students' weaknesses in grammatical analysis as identified in the focus group research. A team of linguists and educational developers designed an ICT (Information and Communication Technology)-based collaborative grammar project task. This became the major assessment component for the module *Academic and Professional Skills for Language Learning* (Orsini-Jones & Jones, 2007, pp. 92-93):

> Working in groups, students were required to create a website containing linked web pages (minimum of three/maximum of five). In each page they had to analyse a sentence. At least one of the three sentences had to be in one of the target languages studied, and the other(s) in English. Students chose three sentences from a list given to them, and each group had to create the relevant analysis and website. The latter had to be uploaded into the Virtual Learning Environment (WebCT)'s collaborative group area, and was available for all students and staff to view and use. Each website had to be presented to the rest of the class by the group which had created it, with the support of a PowerPoint slide presentation to highlight the major issues encountered while completing the project.

Both the websites and the PowerPoint slides were available in WebCT for all students until the end of the academic year following the completion of the project. WebCT was also used to enable students to exchange files and ideas in dedicated discussion forums created for each group. After the presentation had taken place, students had to write an individual reflective report on the project.

The assessed grammar task was revised yearly according to a cycle of action research (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1990). A phase of 'reconnaissance' (or identification of an issue or issues) normally precedes the start of the cycle, followed by planning, implementation/action(s), observation, reflection and re-planning (Orsini-Jones, 2004, p. 192):

- An issue is identified;
- Change is planned collaboratively (staff and students) to address the issue;
- The change process is implemented - 'acted out';
- All agents involved in the change process reflect upon its outcomes, both while it is happening and at the end of the first phase of implementation;
- Actions are taken to re-plan the changes and the second phase of the action-research cycle starts (Carr & Kemmis, 1986; McNiff, 1988; McKernan, 1992; Kember, 2000).

The aim of the grammatical part of the task was to provide students with some elementary tools and a basic framework for analysis, which could be applied to any of the languages they studied, while encouraging them to reflect both as a team and individually on the metacognitive aspects of their learning experience. In line with current trends in the teaching of language and linguistics, the Hallidayan *rank scale* (Halliday, 1985) was used to explain the basic structure of these languages. As suggested in Perkins (2006, pp. 42-43) the aim of the grammar analysis task was to equip the students with the 'conceptual arsenal' of linguistic analysis, to make them fluent in the 'foreign' epistemic game of linguistics. Coulthard (1985, p. 121) summarises the *rank scale* concept:

> A first assumption of a 'categories' description is that the analytic units can be arranged on a *rank-scale* which implies that units are related in a 'consists of' relationship with smaller units combining with other units of the same size to form larger ones. Thus a sentence consists of one or more clauses, each of which in turn consists of one or more groups, and so on. The *structure* of each unit is expressed in terms of permissible combinations of units from the rank below, the structure of a clause for example being described in terms of nominal, verbal, adverbial and prepositional groups.

For the purpose of the grammar project it was decided to use 'phrase' instead of 'group', as the two terms can be used interchangeably in functional grammar, even if some scholars like to underline the finer points of the fuzzy boundaries between them (Quereda, 2006).

Students were provided with examples in class and an example on paper of the type of analysis required. Essentially this involved an analysis of the structure of sentences, clauses, phrases and words in terms of the item immediately below each one on the *rank scale,* and a taxonomy of clauses, phrases, words and morphemes. All the examples used were of formal written language; some were invented by the teaching staff in the relevant languages while others were taken from authentic sources, though often adapted to remove difficulties which went beyond the scope of this particular exercise (see Appendix A for a sample analysis of a sentence).

TROUBLESOME GRAMMAR KNOWLEDGE

The analysis of the interview transcripts, and of the students' reflections in their learning journals and on WebCT's discussion forums showed that students felt challenged mostly by the grammatical categories of morpheme, phrase and clause. Students also found some of the word classifications challenging, e.g. 'adverbs' and the difference between possessive adjectives and possessive pronouns. This confusion could be partially ascribed to what Meyer and Land (2005) define as "tensions arising from the use of competing discourses and existing identities"; the students' 'tacit' knowledge (Meyer and Land, 2003) was proving to be part of the troublesome aspect of their approach to the understanding of the structure of a sentence. Many students had, in fact, been taught grammar formally in their previous educational experience and the new functional grammar terminology displaced these earlier terms and challenged their (false) sense of security about grammar:

> There were certain aspects of the grammar lectures that were being taught in a new way. I'd never learnt about morphemes before and phrases were different. I think we all thought phrases were different to what we were being taught. (Written feedback 2003-2004)

Phrases were perceived as particularly troublesome:

> Interviewer: Now, if I ask you, what is difficult about phrases, what is difficult in grasping how to break down a noun phrase, a prepositional phrase, a verb phrase, what is difficult about it?
>
> Student 1: Probably, erm, probably recognising which is the controlling word within the phrase, well first of all obviously breaking the phrase down, breaking the whole sentence down into phrases, but also knowing whether it's prepositional or if it's a verb phrase, which one controls the type of phrase that it is. I think my interpretation of it is that anything with a preposition is a prepositional phrase. But I wasn't sure how, you know (...) I understood it in class, it was when we went away, and I just seemed to have completely forgotten everything that we did on it, and I think that was when I struggled because when we were sat in here, we'd obviously got help if we had questions, but I did grasp the concept of breaking it down, but when it

> came to applying it to the project (...) I couldn't. I understood the lectures and everything that we did on it but couldn't actually apply it, I think that was the difficulty
>
> Interviewer: Right. Did you feel the same as student 1?
>
> Student 2: Yeah I felt lost.
>
> Interviewer: In lecture times as well?
>
> Student 2: In lecture times as well. You know, I understood the concept for about, lets say 10 seconds, yes yes, I got that and then suddenly, no no, I didn't get that, you know, suddenly, like this.

Because of the complexities of functional grammar, students appeared to grasp some of its components in isolation, but many failed to see the full picture. This proved to be particularly frustrating for students who were fluent speakers of foreign languages. They could unconsciously handle both their native language and the foreign language at the spoken level, but found grammar analysis challenging. Perkins highlights this phenomenon when he points out that 'the Chomskian machine keeps us speaking grammatically in our mother tongues, although we cannot directly introspect its mechanism or rules' (2006, p. 40). A competent linguist must however be able to understand the concept underpinning the hidden architecture of a sentence to function effectively. It can be argued that the discussion about the different meanings of the same words in different contexts is a 'meta' threshold concept for linguists, particularly those who intend to specialise in translation. Interestingly enough, Meyer, Land and Davies (this volume) highlighted the links between variation theory and Ferdinand De Saussure's linguistic theory:

> Variation theory in the phenomenographic tradition seems to constitute an educational application of Saussurian structuralism in linguistics ... in terms of the way in which individual words (*parole*) come to have operational meaning within a language *(langue*). More specifically this comes about through the way in which words come to have specific meaning by not meaning what every other word in a language means, that is through variability of definition...When some new situation arises, which is almost constantly in the use of a language, the structure of awareness and hence the meaning can change dramatically, so the state of variation is again always dynamic.

Although many students admitted they were still struggling with the *rank scale* concept by the end of the academic year, both the assignments that they carried out and the interview data showed that some rays of light (and understanding) were filtering through the metaphorical dark forest. However, the 'opening' sometimes closed down again before they had fully grasped the concept. This would appear to

confirm the oscillation between states reported in Meyer and Land (2005, p. 384). What was puzzling was the fact that some students had grasped the concept for the grammatical analysis of one language but not for that of another. So, for example, some students appeared to have grasped the threshold concept for English, or German, but not both. The fact that British students generally carried out the grammar analysis more accurately for the sentences in the target language studied than for those in English (their native language) provides evidence to support the hypothesis that the threshold concept identified might not be transferable. Could this be due to having first encountered the formal teaching of grammar categories (and related grammatical metacognition) when studying foreign languages rather than English? Or is it due to the different way in which the two languages are processed in the brain? The students themselves appeared to favour the first suggestion, as illustrated in this extract, from the semi-structured interviews recorded in December 2004 (Orsini-Jones & Jones, 2007, p. 100): 'We all contributed to the English sentence. Perhaps we just don't understand English grammar as much as German grammar as we have done so much German grammar during A-level'. It appeared that the majority of British students, who had not been exposed to the formal teaching of grammar categories as much as international students, were struggling more with the 'meta' level of grammar analysis in English. This highlights the importance of pre-liminal variation (Meyer & Land, 2005, p. 12).

In view of both the above definitions of threshold concept and the students' feedback and performance, it could be argued that each of the individual grammar components – morphemes, words, clauses, phrases – were perceived as troublesome even if with different degrees of perceived troublesomeness. There would appear to be some similarities, therefore, between the individual components of the underlying threshold concept and the 'knowledge objects' described by Entwistle and Marton (1994). Some students appeared to be at ease with these concepts when analysed individually, but then struggled when carrying out the grammar analysis of the whole sentence and failed to see the connections amongst them. Others, on the other hand, could see the individual components eventually fit together, like the pieces in a puzzle once it is completed. It could, therefore, be suggested that each of these individual grammar categories is a self-standing threshold concept, which, once mastered, opens up a new door into the next one. Or, as suggested here, it could be argued that the *rank scale* concept underpinning functional grammar is the overarching threshold concept identified here and that it is in turn composed of what could be defined as *the rank scale threshold concept's components*, each of which needed to be crossed in order to grasp the overarching concept.

The interview data helped the tutors in creating activities that would make it easier for students to understand the individual component of the concept. The identification of the stumbling blocks was helped by the analysis of the transcripts. The following are extracts from the semi-structured interviews carried out in December 2004:

The clauses and morphemes are difficult for me I think, because I can't find a correct definition of these two grammar terms, and I have to analyse them in the sentence. [They were difficult] for the group, because everybody has a different idea about clauses. (Student 1)

(...) the morphemes in particular I hadn't really encountered before, so they were the ones that were most difficult to get our heads round really. (Student 2)

The biggest problem we had was trying to work out what the clauses were; the phrases weren't too bad, and the word classification, the nouns, adjectives, that was all right, morphemes were fine. It was just the clauses that are slightly more complex. (Student 3)

We had problems analysing phrases, and then we would bring up the doubts and the questions to the group, and then, when we were stuck, we went to the lecturer to get help about phrases again, looked at grammar books, but it wasn't very helpful. (Student 4)

Interviewer: Did you have any problems with grammar, any areas where you had difficulties, got stuck?

Student 5: Yeah, with distinguishing the phrases and the clauses.

Interviewer: Right, and do you think you've cracked it now?

Student 5: No.

Interestingly, as previously noted (Orsini-Jones & Jones, 2007, p. 100), the initial perception of a new concept as problematic to learn did not always match the reality of what students really found difficult to understand. And vice-versa, there were worrying levels of confidence amongst students who declared in the interviews that they had grasped the principles of the *rank scale* concept but subsequently analysed their sentences incorrectly. This ties in with research carried out by Wenden (1991) on learners' beliefs, which also highlights a weakness in qualitative research, i.e. that sometimes students think that they have learned a concept when they have not,, as beliefs are sometimes held more tenaciously than knowledge. It also ties in with the concept of tacit knowledge (Meyer & Land, 2003). As highlighted by Perkins, 'learners' tacit presumptions can miss the target by miles' (2006, p. 40).

On the whole, it appeared that many students were struggling to see the connections amongst the various components that form the scaffolding that holds a sentence together. Some were also struggling to understand the function of each grammatical 'brick'. The quotes above also confirm that some students – either consciously or unconsciously - were in a state of liminality with reference to

grammar analysis. Although they were attempting to carry out the analysis required, these attempts came through as random guesses and betrayed a lack of true understanding, as reported on the literature on thresholds: 'mimicry (...) seems to involve both attempts at understanding *and* troubled misunderstanding, or limited understanding.' (Meyer & Land, 2005, p. 377).

Motivation and attitudes towards the subject matter studied also impacted upon students' oscillation. The students who struggled most with the grammar analysis were, in some cases, those who did not value the learning experience on the module. Skills and research methodology modules can be perceived as a 'waste of time' by some students, even if they are fully integrated with the subject specific curriculum, like the one described here (for further details on this, see Orsini-Jones, 2004).

To summarise, amongst the factors that appeared to hinder the process of crossing the threshold were:

- 'new to me' terminology (students opposed to change, refusing new type of analysis, refusing its semantics);
- prior (mis)knowledge of terms such as 'phrase' or 'clause' - lecturers had to 'undo' their pre-conceived definitions of the grammar categories involved
- the cohort's composition and the variety of nationalities present in it (e.g. 14 different ones in academic year 2003-2004);
- 'pre-liminal variation' - background and previous grammar learning experience;
- reliance in group work upon peers who found the grammatical categories 'troublesome' but decided nevertheless to take a lead in the analysis of the sentences;
- misunderstanding of the concepts and lack of ability to ask lecturers for help;
- lack of motivation towards the module.

In view of the data collected, it would appear that only a few students crossed the overarching grammar threshold concept identified (the rank scale). Most students could, however, grasp at least some of its components. It is enlightening to analyse student feedback to see how the mastering of individual components was achieved in their view:

I found the first assessment the most challenging. This was to create a web page, breaking up the grammar of a particular sentence in one of the target languages and in English. I think that this was because it was the first assessment and the fact that I was still settling at university. I had never really studied grammar in this depth and found it quite difficult to grasp at first. *However, as we worked as a group, I began to understand more*....I have learnt a lot of grammar and now know all the different aspects of grammar, such as clauses, morphemes, etc. *This has helped me with my two languages a lot.* (Written anonymous feedback, May 2004, emphasis added). (Orsini-Jones & Jones, 2007, p. 101).

The above quotes appear to confirm the results of previous research (Orsini-Jones & Cousin, 2001; Orsini-Jones, 2004; Orsini-Jones & Jones, 2007), i.e. that a combination of student-centred activities, integrated and effective use of technology and constructivist teaching methods can create a 'safe' and 'powerful' learning environment, within which students thrive. Despite the difficulties encountered with the grammar analysis, the perception that the grammar project had greatly enhanced their learning experience was also reflected in the individual reports on the task.

Curriculum design also appeared to help students to overcome 'knowledge blocks'. The data collected in the academic year 2003-2004 informed changes to the grammar task following an action research cycle (McNiff, 1988; McKernan, 1992). In 2004-2005, for example, more time was allocated to explaining the concept of the morpheme, as this had proved troublesome for the students in the previous cohort. Subsequently, most students stated that they were confident they had understood this concept despite their initial difficulties with it, and their marks confirmed their confidence. Ten grammar projects were completed in 2004-2005: in seven groups students had made some mistakes – mostly minor ones – in identifying morphemes correctly, but they had at least demonstrated an understanding of what a morpheme is. This was pleasing to the lecturers involved, as these results compared favourably with those from the previous year and showed that a change in the syllabus can help students to understand troublesome knowledge. The major changes implemented to achieve this result were:

- doubling the time allocated to explaining grammar in general (increased from two to four face-to-face sessions) and morphemes in particular, and changing the assessment of the module to better reflect this increase in grammar input;
- provision of more samples of grammatical analysis;
- provision of more collaborative practice/workshops on morphemes following the lecture on grammar;
- uploading of all the grammatical explanations and exercises onto WebCT for those students who had not been able to attend;
- creation of a dedicated grammar forum in WebCT's discussion area, enabling students to air their concerns. (Orsini-Jones & Jones, 2007, p. 97).

Students' learning journals, the individual reports compiled by students after the completion of the grammar task and the reflective postings in WebCT's discussion forums provided evidence that metareflection can also help with troublesome knowledge. There was evidence that students were acknowledging that they were undergoing change. The acknowledgement of the transformative impact of the learning experience upon an individual with reference to the module *Academic and Professional Skills for Language Learning* can be seen in this extract:

> I believe I have changed as a learner. This module has introduced new ideas, methods and programmes which was not covered as much in A-Levels and GCSEs. I heave learnt more about key skills for languages, listening, reading, writing and speaking. It has helped me for work in other subjects like coursework, presentations both group and individually and exams. I have also learnt more about grammar ideas and skills and identifying parts of speech. I feel this module has helped me very much this year.

There were students whose work demonstrated that they had crossed the threshold concept identified by the end of the year and many commented on the beneficial and transferable nature of the knowledge acquired (Orsini-Jones & Jones, 2007, p. 102):

> From doing this project I have definitely learned a lot more about grammar. Initially English grammar such as morphemes and derivation and inflection. This has in turn helped my understanding of foreign grammar. I think English people would benefit if we were taught grammar at a younger age, as people are in foreign countries. ...Learning some terms for certain words (nouns, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions) was also helpful as it is helping me with understanding both English and the target languages I am studying. (Portfolio reflective entry about the grammar project, May 2004).

CONCLUSION

The evidence collected shows that the grammar project task has somewhat helped students in making gradual steps towards understanding the threshold concept identified – the *rank scale* – as well as grammatical analysis in general. Collaborative work on the tasks set and metareflection also proved to help with overcoming knowledge blocks and helped students to develop a professional approach to their work. However, as proposed by Perkins, a constructivist approach like the one adopted for the development of the grammar project described here, does not suit all learners as it requires a high level of cognitive engagement 'and not all learners respond well to the challenge' (2006, p. 36).

The student feedback and performance informed changes in the way the grammar task was delivered in 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. Such changes have made some elements of the scaffolding supporting the hierarchical structure of a sentence like morphemes and words less troublesome for students than in previous academic years. However, the overarching threshold concept identified here is closely linked to the way language is processed and can be influenced by a variety of factors, such as affective, personality and motivation factors (Chomsky, 1968; Krashen, 1981; Krashen & Terrell, 1983). This might add an extra layer of difficulty, as whenever language is the focus of analysis, the 'discursive reconfiguration' (Meyer & Land, 2005) and the repositioning necessary to bring a threshold concept into view require an extra 'meta' level of analysis.

However, by the end of the year, some of the students who had managed to grasp the *rank scale* concept became very aware that there was an extra dimension to grammar analysis which was new to them and that had opened new doors of linguistic understanding. The realisation that the *rank scale* unlocked the hidden

architecture of a sentence *transformed* their perception of language learning and language analysis. Some students also stated that grasping the *rank scale* concept had helped them in analysing sentences in all the languages they were studying. They were now able to transfer the concept and this was enabling them to see grammar links that they had not seen before. However, both the *integrative* nature of this concept and its *irreversibility* came under discussion when, in some cases, students were able to understand the concept and apply it to the analysis of sentences in one language (e.g. German) but not another (e.g. English). Could it be possible that the *rank scale* concept is a threshold concept that can only be transferred within the same language, not across different languages? Or does it require more time – and the crossing of more thresholds – for some students to see the connections between languages?

More research is needed to answer the above questions and to investigate further the integrative and irreversible nature of the rank scale threshold concept.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Sample analysis of a sentence according to the rank scale concept

Bundling his black cassock around himself, the bishop climbed into the back seat and settled in for the infuriatingly long drive to the country retreat (adapted from Brown 2003, p. 205)

Bundling	verb	verb phrase - verb	Reduced clause
his	adjective	noun phrase - d object	
black	adjective		
cassock	noun		
around	preposition	preposition phrase - adjunct	
himself	pronoun		
the	article	noun phrase - subject	Main clause
bishop	noun		
climbed	verb	verb phrase - verb	
into	preposition	preposition phrase - adjunct	
the	article		
back	adjective		
seat	noun		
and	conjunction		Main clause
(the bishop)		*noun phrase - subject*	
settled	verb	verb phrase - verb	
in	adverb		
for	preposition	preposition phrase - adjunct	
the	article		
infuriatingly	adverb		
long	adjective		
drive	noun		
to	preposition		
the	article		
country	noun		
retreat	noun		

Sample Morphemes:

bundl(e)-	free (root)
-ing	bound (inflection)
infuriat(e)-	free (root)
-ing-	bound (inflection)
-ly	bound (derivation)

NOTES

[1] 'In the middle of our life's journey, I found myself in a dark forest, as the right way had been lost'.

[2] Please note that some of the data reported has been published in a forthcoming article by Orsini Jones and Jones (forthcoming, 2007).

[3] These characteristics were those of the students in academic year 2002-2003 as reported in Orsini-Jones (2004).

REFERENCES

Ackermann, E. (1996). Perspective-taking and object construction. In Y. Kasai & M. Resnick (Eds.), *Constructionism in practice: Designing, thinking and learning in a digital world* (pp. 25-35). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Alighieri, D. (2005). *Divina commedia*. Roma, Newton Compton.

Brown, D. (2003). *The da Vinci code*. New York: Bantam/Random House.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical*. Brighton: Falmer Press.

Chomsky, N. (1968). *Language and mind*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Coulthard, M. (1985). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Harlow: Longman.

Entwistle, N. J. & Marton, F. (1994). Knowledge objects: Understandings constituted through intensive academic study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 64*, 161-178.

Halliday, M. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Kafai, Y. & Resnick, M. (1996). *Constructionism in practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kember, D. (2000). *Action learning and action research: Improving the quality of teaching and learning*. London: Kogan Page.

Kemmis, S. & McTaggart, R. (Eds.) (1990). *The action research reader*. Victoria: Deakin University.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D. & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Laurillard, D. (1993). *Rethinking university teaching*. London: Routledge

McKernan, J. (1992) *Curriculum action research*. London: Kogan Page.

McNiff, J. (1988). *Action research: Principles and practices*. London: Routledge.

Meyer, J. H. F. & Land, R. (2003). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (1). Linkages to ways of thinking and practising within the disciplines. In C. Rust (Ed.), *Improving student learning*

– *Ten years on* (pp. 412-424). Proceedings of the 2002 10th International Symposium, the Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development. Oxford: OCSLD.

Meyer, J. H. F. & Land, R. (2005). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (2): Epistemological considerations and a conceptual framework for teaching and learning. *Higher Education, 49*, 373-388.

Meyer, J. H. F. & Land, R. (2006). *Overcoming barriers to student understanding: Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Meyer, J. H. F., Land, R. & Davies, P. (2006). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (4): Issues of variation and variability. Paper presented at the *Threshold Concepts within the Disciplines* Symposium, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, 30th Aug.-1st Sept.

Orsini-Jones, M. & Cousin, G. (2001). Focus research in modern languages: Creating a 'powerful learning environment' for students with students'. In J. A. Coleman, D. Ferney, D. Head, & R. Rix (Eds.), *Language-learning futures: Issues and strategies for modern languages provision in higher education* (pp. 71-82). London: Central Books/CILT.

Orsini-Jones, M. (2004). Supporting a course in new literacies and skills for linguists with a Virtual Learning Environment: Results from a staff/student collaborative action-research project at Coventry University, *ReCALL, 16* (1), 189-209.

Orsini-Jones, M. & Jones, D. (2007). Supporting collaborative grammar learning via a Virtual Learning Environment (VLE): A case study from Coventry University. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 6* (1), 90-106

Perkins, D. (2006). Constructivism and troublesome knowledge. In J. H. F. Meyer & R. Land *Overcoming barriers to student understanding: Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge* (pp. 33-47). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) for Higher Education (2002). *Languages and related studies, subject benchmark statement*. Gloucester: QAA.

Quereda, L. (2006). The unit "*group*" in Halliday's *An introduction to functional grammar*, available online at http://www.ugr.es/~lquereda/the_unit_group.htm (last accessed 29/07/06).

Warren, D. (2002). Curriculum design in a context of widening participation in higher education. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 1*(1), 85-99.

Wenden, A. L. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. New York: Prentice Hall.

AFFILIATION

Marina Orsini-Jones
Coventry University